

Panaji, 3rd March, 2022 (Phalgun 12, 1943)

SERIES II No. 49



OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Co-operation

Office of the Asst. Registrar of Co-operative Societies

Notification

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, Shree Brahmashwar Vividha Self help Group Co-op Society Ltd., Fanaswadi, Navelim, Bicholim- Goa is registered under Code Symbol No. RCSBZ2021220003.

Rajendra B. Naik Satardekar, Asstt. Registrar, Bicholim Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Sankhali, 09th February, 2022.

Certificate of Registration

"Shree Brahmashwar Vividha Self help Group Co-op Society Ltd.", Fanaswadi, Navelim, Bicholim-Goa, has been registered on 09-02-2022 and its bears registration Code Symbol No. RCSBZ2021220003 and it is classified as "General Society" under sub-classification No. 12-(c)-others in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003.

Rajendra B. Naik Satardekar, Asstt. Registrar, Bicholim Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Sankhali, 09th February, 2022.

Notification

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, The Madhuban Quela Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited, The Madhuban Quela, Opp. Venkatesh Leela Hotel, Quela, Ponda-Goa is registered under Code Symbol No. RCSPZ2021-220006.

Pankaj V. Marathe, Asstt. Registrar, Ponda Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Ponda, 07th February, 2022.

Certificate of Registration

"The Madhuban Quela Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited", The Madhuban Quela, Opp. Venkatesh Leela Hotel, Quela, Ponda-Goa, has been registered on 07-02-2022 and its bears registration Code Symbol No. RCSPZ2021-220006, and it is classified as "Co-operative Housing Society" under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

Pankaj V. Marathe, Asstt. Registrar, Ponda Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Ponda, 07th February, 2022.

Notification

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, Sayyadri Awaas Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Ltd., Near Navjivan Hospital, Haveli, Curti, Ponda-Goa is registered under Code Symbol No. RCSPZ2021220004.

Pankaj V. Marathe, Asstt. Registrar, Ponda-Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Ponda, 16th November, 2021.

Certificate of Registration

"Sayyadri Awaas Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Ltd.", Near Navjivan Hospital, Haveli, Curti, Ponda-Goa, has been registered on 16-11-2021 and its bears registration Code Symbol No. RCSPZ2021220004 and it is classified as "Co-operative Housing Society" under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

Pankaj V. Marathe, Asstt. Registrar, Ponda-Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Ponda, 16th November, 2022.

Notification

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, Sumit Mount Building No. 1 Co-operative Housing Society Ltd., Bazar Mol, behind St. Marys High School, Ponda-Goa is registered under Code Symbol No. RCSPZ2021220005.

Pankaj V. Marathe, Asstt. Registrar, Ponda-Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Ponda, 14th December, 2021.

Certificate of Registration

Sumit Mount Building No.1 Co-operative Housing Society Ltd., Bazar Mol, behind St. Marys High School, Ponda-Goa has been registered on 14-12-2021 and its bears registration Code Symbol No. RCSPZ2021220005 and it is classified as "Co-operative Housing Society" under sub-classification No. 7-(b)-Co-partnership Housing Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

Pankaj V. Marathe, Asstt. Registrar, Ponda-Zone (Co-operative Societies).

Ponda, 14th December, 2021.

**Department of General Administration****Notification**

No. 26/1/88-GAD/651

Read: Notification No. 26/1/88-GAD/251 dated 29-4-2015.

Upon posting of Shri Sanjiv Gadkar, IAS, as Director of Vigilance vide order No. 6/10/2017-PER-/3073 dated 29-11-2021, the Government of Goa is pleased to declare the post of Director of Vigilance as Ex-Officio Special Secretary to Government with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shripad Arlekar, Under Secretary (GA).

Porvorim, 23rd February, 2022.

**Department of Labour****Order**

No. 28/05/2022-LAB/97

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Varda Enterprises, Margao

Industrial Estate, St. Jose de Areal, Margao, Goa and its workmen, represented by the Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said dispute");

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji, Goa, constituted under Section 7(1) of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. Varda Enterprises, Margao Industrial Estate, St. Jose de Areal, Margao, Goa in terminating the services of workmen shown in Annexure hereto upon closure of the establishment, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?".

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 22nd February, 2022.

Annexure

Sr. No.	Name of the workmen	Date of termination
1.	Gokuldas O. Velip	01-02-2020.
2.	Ramchandra A. Naik	01-02-2020.
3.	Raksha R. Naik	01-02-2020.
4.	Francisco Xavier Castanha	01-02-2020.
5.	Martinho Fernandes	01-02-2020.
6.	Ivon Dias	01-02-2020.
7.	Andrew Gomes	01-02-2020.
8.	Alexiana Fernandes	01-02-2020.
9.	Sucorina Fernandes	01-02-2020.
10.	Severina Noronha	01-02-2020.

Notification

No. 28/2/2022-LAB/87

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on

07-02-2022 in Ref. No. IT/87/2000 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 18th February, 2022.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND
LABOUR COURT
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Ms. Bela N. Naik, Hon'ble
Presiding Officer)

Ref. No. IT/87/2000

Shri E. A. Dhumaskar (Technician),
Rep. by the President,
Zuari Agro Chemicals Ltd.,
Employees Union (Goa),
P.O. Zuarinagar-Goa ... Workman/Party I.
V/s

M/s. Zuari Industries Ltd.,
Jaikisan Bhavan,
Zuarinagar-Goa ... Employer/Party II.

Workman/Party I represented by Ld. Adv. V.
Menezes along with Adv. Ms. S. Narvekar.

Employer/Party II represented by Learned Adv. G.
K. Sardessai along with Adv. Ms. S. Bangera.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 7th day of the month
of February of the year 2022)

By Order dated 24-11-2000, bearing No. IRM/CON//SG/(47)/2000/5888, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short 'The Act'), has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s Zuari Industries Ltd., Jaikisan Bhavan, Zuarinagar-Goa, in terminating the services of Shri E. A. Dhumaskar, technician, with effect from 18-07-2000, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/87/2000 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the parties. Pursuant to service of notices, Party I filed a Claim Statement at Exb. 2 and Party II filed its Written Statement at Exhibit 4.

3. In short, the case of the Party I/Workman is that the Zuari Agro Chemicals Employees Union, Goa is herein referred to as "the Union" which is a Trade Union registered under the Trade Union's Act, 1926 and represents an overwhelming majority of the workmen of M/s Zuari Industries Limited (Fertilizer Division), with its Factory at Zuarinagar, Goa which is a sole bargaining agent of the workmen of M/s Zuari Industries Limited which is herein referred to as the "the Company". The Zuari Industries Limited is a limited Company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956, having its registered Office at Jaikissan Bhavan, Zuarinagar, Goa and the present dispute is in respect to one of its workmen namely; Shri E. A. Dhumaskar, employed at the fertilizer factory at Zuarinagar, Goa and the said Company is one of the most reputed organization in the manufacture of chemical fertilizers in the Country having a large factory at Zuarinagar and its financial position is very strong.

4. The Party I/Workman further states that the Party II Company indulged in unfair labour practices within the factory premises and has illegally terminated the Party I member-workman of the Union. The workman was orally directed to put in writing, details with respect to certain happenings in shift III and I on 19-05-2000 and 20-05-2000 with respect to purported entry of acid into Stream III during regeneration of Stream II as it was alleged that during the said process on 19-05-2000 and 20-05-2000, there were purported abnormalities. The workman accordingly placed the details of the happenings in his shift by letter dated 25-01-2000, however, surprisingly by letter dated 24-05-2000 the workman was issued a charge-sheet which was illegal based on allegation that the workman while carrying out the operation of regeneration of Stream II, while injecting acid in Cation II, acid also entered into Stream III causing contamination of polished water and that the workman ignored the continuous flashing on the computer screen which indicated that there was an abnormality to be attended to and thereby failed to take remedial action at the appropriate time, as a result of which, the plant had to be stopped leading to delay in recommencement of production. The charges mentioned in the charge-sheet did not concur with the facts set out in the charge-sheet. The misconduct alleged, even if proved would not be grave enough to warrant the punishment of dismissal from service.

5. The Party I further claimed that the Party II vide same letter dated 24-05-2000 also illegally suspended his services without assigning any reason. The charge-sheet dated 24-05-2000 informed the Party I that the management has decided to initiate a

Domestic enquiry into the said charges and the enquiry has been fixed on 30-5-2000 at 10.00 a.m. and called upon him to submit his explanation which clearly shows premeditated intention on the part of the management to dismiss him without affording any hearing or proper enquiry. The workman replied to the said charge-sheet denying the charges set out therein and also sought time for submitting the explanation which was denied to him by the management and his request to permit him to be represented by an advocate was also turned down by the management and also requested that the Domestic enquiry scheduled for 30-05-2000 be rescheduled by further one week which request was also denied. The workman also requested revocation of his suspension order and the same was duly denied. He also requested for the copies of the documents that the management would rely upon for the Domestic enquiry to be given to him in advance so as to enable him to reply to the charge-sheet and prepare his defence for the enquiry which was never given to him along with the list of witnesses of the management.

6. The Party I further claimed that the representative of the workman, Shri Nicholas D'Mello by letter dated 25-06-2000 informed the management that Shri L. M. Chandrashekharan who had been appointed as Enquiry Officer was an interested party and that he should be replaced and the company thus changed and appointed Shri V. K. Goyal, Dy. General Manager as new Enquiry Officer and rescheduled the enquiry for 01-06-2000. The Enquiry Officer took on record the appointment letters without furnishing the copies of the same to the workman. The workman's representative objected to Shri V. N. Sahakari being appointed as management representative being interested Party which objection was denied by the Enquiry Officer. The Management Representative (MR) gave his statement after which the workman representative insisted on cross examining the MR which request was denied causing the workman prejudice in his defence and thereafter several documents which were requested to be produced by the workman were refused by the Enquiry Officer and the management was directed to lead the evidence through its witness, Shri R. G. Prabhugaonkar. The workman through its representative sought longer adjournment as three days were not sufficient to prepare cross examination which was denied to him. The charge-sheet, suspension order or dismissal letter were not signed by a person who was empowered to sign the same. The management was in a hurry to complete the enquiry and denied the workman an opportunity to defend himself.

7. The representative of the workman was also forced to cross-examine the witness, Shri R. G. Prabhu. The evidence of Shri R. G. Prabhu indicates that no fault would have been attributed to the workman for any negligence or default in carrying out his normal duties. The documents including the log books showing recordings on 19-05-2000 was not given to him. The safety buzzer which would alert the workman about any malfunction or emergency was not working at the relevant time and the situation on that date was not normal and the workload was more than usual. The computer was showing erratic reading in the past and the alarm which was not working was repaired after the incident. The Enquiry Officer was in a hurry to conduct the enquiry and was purposely not affording the workman a reasonable opportunity to defend himself during the enquiry. The workman was not paid adequate subsistence allowance in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders. The request for furnishing several documents and details to place a proper defence was denied and principles of natural justice has not been followed. The workman states that he had an unblemished past service of 22 years with the company. He was illegally and unjustifiably dismissed from the service of the company. The termination of the workman is illegal, predetermined by the management and was only a façade to victimize him. The Union approached the office of the Labour Commissioner to take the matter in conciliation. The conciliation proceedings, however ended in failure and the appropriate Government vide order dated 24-11-2000 referred the dispute for adjudication. Hence, the reference.

8. In the Written Statement, the Party II has stated that the charge-sheet was issued to Party I workman who was employed as a technician at its fertilizer unit alleging that he injected acid in Cation II and while carrying out operations, the acid also entered into Stream III thus causing contamination of polished water which was the result of failure on the part of Party I workman to close the appropriate valves at the time of injection of acid and check the conductivity meters in the line of other Streams as part of normal procedure adopted during regeneration operation. The Party I workman ignored continuous flashing on the computer screen which indicated that there was an abnormality to be attended to and that he failed to take remedial action at the appropriate time and as a result of this contamination, the Plant had to be stopped causing huge financial loss to the company and damage to the Plant and MKachinery. A charge-sheet was issued and Shri V. K. Goyal was appointed as Enquiry Officer and after conclusion of the enquiry, the

Enquiry Officer submitted a reasoned finding on 30-06-2000. The enquiry was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and every conceivable opportunity was extended to Party I. The Management on receipt of the enquiry considered the said report and concurred with the findings of the Enquiry Officer. The management also considered the past record of the employee and did not find any extenuating circumstances and considering the gravity of the proved misconduct decided to impose on Party I workman grave punishment of dismissal. He was issued a show cause notice as to why he should not be dismissed from service along with the enquiry report. Party I submitted his reply and the management after perusing the said reply did not find the explanation satisfactory and therefore, decided to dismiss him from his service and accordingly was dismissed by letter dated 18-07-2000. The termination by way of dismissal of Party I workman was legal and justified and therefore, reference deserves to be dismissed.

9. In the Rejoinder at Exhibit 5, the Party I denied the case put forth by Party II in the Written Statement.

10. Based on the above mentioned pleadings, my Learned Predecessor has framed the Issues at Exhibit 6 and the same are as follows:

ISSUES

1. Whether the Party I/Union proves that the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman Shri E. A. Dhumaskar is not fair and proper?
2. Whether the charges of misconduct leveled against the workman Shri E. A. Dhumaskar are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence?
3. Whether the Party I/Union proves that termination of services of the workman Shri E. A. Dhumaskar is by way of victimization and unfair labour practice?
4. Whether the Party I/Union proves that action of the Party II in terminating the services of the workman Shri E. A. Dhumaskar w.e.f. 18-07-2000 is illegal and unjustified?
5. Whether the workman Shri E. A. Dhumaskar is entitled to any relief?

11. It is matter of record that the issue Nos. 1 and 2 were ordered to be treated as preliminary issues and in the course of evidence on the remaining issues, the Party I/Shri E. A. Dhumaskar examined himself as its first witness and brought on record copy of the inquiry proceedings which is at Exh. E-1 Colly, copy of the letter dated 25-05-2000 from Party II at Exh. W-1,

copy of the letter dated 25-05-2000 from the Workman at Exh. W-2, Xerox copy of the letter dated 02-06-2000 at Exh. W-3, Xerox copy of the letter dated 05-06-2000 at Exh. W-4. During cross-examination a copy of letter dated 25-05-2000 is taken on record and marked as Exh. E-2.

12. The Party I examined its 2nd witness Shri Shailesh S. Narvekar and through this witness brought on record a copy of the letter dated 26-05-2000 at Exh. W-5, copy of the letter dated 01-06-2000 at Exh. W-6 and a copy of the letter dated 05-06-2000 at Exh. W-7. Later, this witness was recalled and through him brought on record copies of applications for leave dated 28-01-2005, 17-02-2005, 12-04-2005 and 23-11-2004 at Exh. 19 Colly, copies of applications for leave (3 in nos.) at Exh. 20 Colly, copies of LTA form of employees at Exh. 21, copies of medical reimbursement forms (4 in nos.) at Exh. 22 Colly, copy of the letters dated 23-06-2005, 18-11-2004, 09-06-2004, 12-04-2004, and 16-10-2004 at Exh. 23 Colly, copy of nomination in form 'A' at Exh. 24, copy of nomination form 'F' at Exh. 25, and copies of applications dated 18-06-2003, 12-09-1985, 21-08-2000 and 07-01-1999 at Exh. 26 Colly and the Party I closed his evidence.

13. On the other hand, the Party II examined Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal and closed its evidence.

14. Heard arguments. Learned Advocate Shri V. Menezes argued on behalf of Party I and Learned Adv. Shri G. K. Sardessai argued on behalf of Party II. Both the Parties have placed on record their written submissions.

15. I have gone through the records of the case and has duly considered the arguments advanced and also the arguments placed on record and after going through the same, I have given my reasons and findings on the issues which are framed and the same are as follows:

Issue No.1 and 2	Already decided in Part Award.
Issue No. 3	In the Negative.
Issue No.4	In the Negative.
Issue No.5	As per the final Order.

REASONS

16. Issue No. 1 is answered in the negative by my Learned Predecessor by virtue of passing the Part Award dated 26-07-2018 by holding that the inquiry conducted against the workman/Party I is fair and proper. Issue No. 2 is answered in the affirmative by holding that the charges of misconduct leveled against the workman/Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence. Hence, this Tribunal now has to decide only Issue No. 3, 4, and 5.

Issue No. 3:

17. The Party I Shri E. A. Dhumaskar filed his Affidavit-in-Evidence and examined himself as first witness and, Shri Sailesh Narvekar, the Secretary of the Employees Union of M/s Zuari Agro Chemicals Ltd. as the second witness after which the Party I closed his case. On behalf of the Employer/Party II they examined Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal (retired) who was working as a Dy. General Manager with the Party II.

18. The Party I has mentioned in his Affidavit-in-Evidence the detailed facts of his case and has also produced various documents in support of his case and I have perused all these documents in deciding the instant case. That according to him, he is an active member of the said Union and in the past he had never received any charge-sheet, Memo or Warning Letter for any act of misconduct alleged by the Company since the time he joined his services on 19-07-1978 as a Trainee. He states that from Junior Technician he was promoted as a Senior Technician and he has worked without any adverse action against him by the Management in 22 years of his service till his illegal termination. He has also mentioned in detail as to how the alleged incident occurred and he states that he received the charge-sheet dated 24-05-2001 which is at Exh. E-1 Colly at page-4 and the charges made against him are false. He has even mentioned the details of the enquiry and the manner in which it was conducted and these facts are not necessary to be discussed now as they are already decided while deciding issue No.1.

19. It is his allegation that he was illegally and unjustifiably dismissed from the services of the Company by way of victimization. In order to decide this issue, it becomes necessary to look into the evidence of the Party I and the material documents relating to this issue. But as far, as the plea of victimization is concerned, the Party I has not led proper and sufficient evidence and the nature of alleged victimization carried out by the Party II. It is a settled law that the plea of victimization or the burden of proving this issue always lie on the Party making such allegations. In the instant case, there are no precise pleadings and vague suggestions are not enough to prove the nature of victimization. My Learned Predecessor has held that the charges of misconduct leveled against the Party I have been proved by the Party II and has also come to the conclusion that Party I was responsible for commission of the acts of misconduct and due to his carelessness and negligence there was loss and damage to the property of the Party II. The Management conducted an inquiry into the charges against the Party I and after the conclusion of the

inquiry, the Inquiry Officer submitted a reasoned finding dated 30-06-2000 holding the charged workman guilty of the charges. On receipt of the Inquiry Report, the Party II considered the said report and concurred with the findings of the Inquiry Officer considered the past record of the employee and did not find any extenuating circumstances and considering the gravity of proved misconduct and the Party II decided to impose the grave punishment of dismissal and the Party I was issued a show cause notice as to why he should not be dismissed from service and a copy of the inquiry report was furnished to him along with the show cause notice. The Party I submitted his reply dated 14-07-2000 and the Party II after perusing the said reply did not find the explanation to the show cause notice satisfactory and therefore decided to dismiss the Party I from service of Party II and accordingly the Party I was dismissed from services by letter of dismissal dated 18-07-2000.

20. As regards to the charges of misconduct leveled against the Party I under Clause 22 (XIII) and Clause 22 (XVII) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Party II Company is concerned, this Tribunal in its part Award dated 26-07-2018 observed as follows:

"It is therefore evident that the system was not faulty, instruments were not defective, video flashing was visible in computer monitor and conductivity details were visible, which shows that the Party I is solely responsible for the contamination due to his willful and irresponsible act of ignoring the flashing alarms on computer showing rise in conductivity.

Needless to mention, the Party I/Workman was on duty at the water treatment Plant and that he had done regeneration of Stream II, so also he was conversant with the normal procedure to be adopted for regeneration. There is also no dispute that during regeneration of Stream II, acid had entered into Stream II causing contamination of polished water and dropping of pH of polished water resulting in damage to the Plant and work process. The Party I/Workman was in-charge of the said section during the aforesaid period and therefore was responsible for commission of the acts of misconduct due to his carelessness and negligence under the Certified Standing Orders of the Company.

The evidence led by the Parties before the Inquiry Officer and before the Court proves that the acid injection valve which was in closed condition was opened by Party I due to his carelessness and subsequently ignored the flashing alarm on the computer which showed rise in conductivity and

inspite of that failed to inform the superior. During the domestic inquiry Shri S. D. Nadkarni has stated that Shri Dhumaskar continued to remain in the shift in place of Shri D. C. Lotlikar and if Shri Lotlikar had taken charge of DM section, he would have detected the problem in DM section by going through computer page and would have detected that Stream III had gone bad in the beginning of the shift itself. Nor he informed the shift manger and chose to continue in the same section, without taking corrective action, which was required thereby being guilty of gross neglect of work and loss and damage to the property of the Party II.

20. Learned Adv. Shri G. K. Sardessai has placed reliance on the following authority:

(1) Bharat Iron Works v/s Baghubhai Balubhai Patel and others AIR 1976 SC 98—para 15 wherein it has been held that “*7. Ordinarily a person is victimized, if he is made a victim or a scapegoat and is subjected to persecution, prosecution or punishment for no real fault or guilt of his own. If actual fault or guilt meriting punishment is established, such action will be rid of the taint of victimization.*

Victimization may partake of various types, as for example, pressurizing an employee to leave the Union or Union activities, treating an employee in a discriminatory manner or inflicting a grossly monstrous punishment which no rational person would impose upon an employee and the like. Victimization is a serious charge by an employee against an employer and, therefore, it must be properly and adequately pleaded. The charge must not be vague or indefinite. The fact that there is a Union espousing the cause of the employees in legitimate trade Union activity and an employee is a member or active office-bearer thereof, is per se no crucial instance.

The onus of establishing a plea of victimization will be upon the person pleading it. Since a charge of victimization is a serious matter reflecting to a degree, upon the subjective attitude of the employer evidenced by acts and conduct, these have to be established by safe and sure evidence. Mere allegations, vague suggestions and insinuations are not enough. All particulars of the charge brought out, if believed, must be weighed by the Tribunal and a conclusion should be reached on totality of the evidence produced.

Victimization must be directly connected with the activities of the concerned employee inevitably leading to the penal action without the necessary proof of valid charge against him”.

21. I have perused the above authority in deciding the instant case and the ratio applied in the above authority gets attracted to the facts of the present case and guided by the above authorities and in view of the above reasons it is abundantly clear that the Party I/Workman failed to prove that the Employer followed unfair labour practice and so also failed to prove the allegations of he being victimized which led to his dismissal in services. Accordingly, issue No. 3 is answered in the negative.

Issue No. 4

22. It is the contention of the Party I Union that the action of the Party II in terminating the services of the workman Shri E. A. Dhumaskar w.e.f. 18-07-2000 is illegal and unjustified and based on this allegation, the present issue has been framed with a burden on Party I to prove the same. In my considered opinion, the major aspects and the facts relating to this issue have already been discussed by my Learned Predecessor while deciding issue No. 1 and 2 while passing the Part Award but nevertheless, it is useful and necessary to decide this issue in view of the evidence led by both the Parties before this Tribunal vis-à-vis their documents and also by taking into consideration the contents of the domestic inquiry conducted by the Inquiry Officer of the Management has submitted the detailed findings dated 30-07-2000 holding the workman guilty of the charges.

23. The charges against the Workman in the charge-sheet dated 24-05-2000 relates to the incidence dated 19-05-2000 and 20-05-2000 which took place between 21.30 hrs. and 8.30 the next morning and the first charge specifically states that the Workman failed to close the appropriate valves at the time of injection of acid during the regeneration operation. The workman who examined himself has not led any evidence to prove that there was a system failure and if one goes through his entire deposition it only states that the manner in which the inquiry was conducted and his grievance to that effect. There is no supporting evidence to this effect.

24. The second charge against the workman is that he failed to notice the flashing on the computer screen which indicated abnormality which came to the notice of the Asst. Manager at 4.30 a.m. From the evidence of the Parties and by virtue of the Part Award it is abundantly clear that the inquiry was conducted in a fair manner by complying with all the principles of natural justice and the Party I was given every opportunity to defend himself and a fair hearing was conducted and through this it stands established that the Party I workman was on duty at the above mentioned time at the Water Treatment Plant and he was working in the morning shift in the Cooling

Section. It has also come on record that the Party I workman had made a mutual change in the shift with his colleague who worked in the same Cooling Section with the Party I. Therefore there is no doubt that Mr. Dhumaskar was on duty from 16.00 hrs. of 19-05-2000 to 8.00 hrs. of 20-05-2000 and during this period he worked in the DM Section of the Water Treatment Plant. There is no evidence denying this fact. It has also come on record through the evidence of the Management Witness-2 that when he came for duty at 16.00 hrs. on 19-05-2000 he found on the Computer Monitor that all the three systems were in line and Stream-II was nearing exhaust and the Workman in his cross-examination has stated that he completed the Stream-II regeneration at 4.30 hrs. of 20-05-2000 approx. and took Stream-II online which goes to show that the work of regeneration was required to be done and had been done by the Workman while he was on duty from 19-05-2000 to 20-05-2000.

25. It has also come on record that around 5.30 hrs. of 20-05-2000 that, it was informed by the Shift Manager of the Power Plant that there was a problem in one of the Boilers and after noticing the problem it was decided to stop the Boiler. The first witness of the Management has clearly stated that when they were making arrangements to start another Boiler, it was informed by the Shift Manager of the Water Treatment Plant, that the polished water pH had dropped and after confirming from the Laboratory results, that the pH of polished water was low, the plant was stopped. The turbo generator was tripped and all the Boilers stopped subsequently. He has also stated that the pH level had become so slow that they could not keep the Plant running as it could cause further damage to the Plant. The Management's first witness has stated in his cross-examination that low pH had caused damage to the Boilers, turbines, pipings and the Plant was shut down for almost ten days which led to heavy production loss and according to him if this low pH operation had continued for some days, this would have caused a major accident in the Plant and would have damaged the machinery more seriously. All this goes to show that this happened on account of sheer negligence on part of the workman who failed to follow the normal proceedings which are necessary to be carried out during regeneration. The Workman did not lead any evidence to show that he had closed the appropriate acid injection valves of other Streams at the time of injection of the acid and he also ignored the continuous flashing on the Computer screen which indicated that there was abnormality which had to be looked into. The Workman did not take remedial action at the appropriate time nor he checked the drop in the pH of polisher and polished water.

26. Hence, it stands proved that the workman Mr. Dhumaskar was on duty from 16.00 hrs. of 19-05-2000 to 8.00 hrs. of 20-05-2000 at the Water Treatment Plant and he had done regeneration of Stream-II. During the regeneration of Stream-II, acid entered into Stream-III causing contamination of polished water and dropping of pH of polished water causing damage to the Plant and Machinery which resulted to stoppage of work and of Plant for ten days which in turn caused a financial loss and on account of this negligent act of the Workman and as such he is guilty of gross neglect of work under clauses 22(XIII) of the Certified Standing Orders. The Workman is also responsible and guilty for causing loss and damage to the property of the establishment in view of Clause 22(XVII) of the Certified Standing Orders. The evidence also shows that the Workman had opened the valve out of sheer negligence and he further committed gross neglect by ignoring the flashing alarms on Computer which showed rise in conductivity and further chose not to inform his superiors and choosing to continue in the same section proves that the Workman had not taken proper precautions but was negligent and careless. For this act of the Workman the Management conducted a fair and proper domestic inquiry as per the Standing Orders by following the principles of natural justice and after the inquiry was conducted and upon receipt of the report prepared by the Inquiry Officer who gave reasoned findings dated 30-06-2000/Exh.E-1 Colly, the Management considered the said report along with the findings of the Inquiry Officer and a show cause notice was issued to the Workman as to why he should not be dismissed from services to which Mr. Dhumaskar, the Workman submitted his reply dated 14-07-2000 and the Management did not find any sound and satisfactory explanation to the said show cause notice and as such decided to dismiss him from the services and accordingly he was dismissed by the Letter of Dismissal dated 18-07-2000. Therefore, this also goes to show that the action of the Party II in terminating the services of the Workman/Shri E. A. Dhumaskar w.e.f. 18-07-2000 is legal and justified. Accordingly, issue No. 4 is answered in the negative. The evidence of Shri Shailesh Narvekar, the second witness of the Party I does not help the workman in proving this issue anywhere.

27. The evidence led by the Management through Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal again shows the manner in which the inquiry was conducted. He was appointed as an Inquiry Officer to inquire into the charges leveled against the Party I. His findings dated 30-06-2000 are at Exh.E-1 Colly and according to him they are the proceedings of the inquiry conducted

by him along with his findings which are true and correct records of the inquiry. He has stated in his cross that the documents produced by the Management in the course of the inquiry were furnished to the Party I. He has also stated in cross that he did not allow Party I to cross-examine the Management Representative on the same date as he wanted to give an opportunity to the Party I to go through the entire evidence produced by the Management and thereafter to cross-examine the Management Representative on the said evidence. He has also stated that he gave some time to the Party I to inspect the Log Book.

Issue No. 5.

28. Issue No.5 needs to be answered in the negative because the Party I has failed to prove that the termination of services of the Workman Shri E. A. Dhumaskar was illegal, unjustified, was by way of victimizations and by following unfair labour practice. The said Workman filed his Affidavit-in-Evidence at Exh. 40 stating that he never in the past received any charge-sheet, Memo or any Warning letter for any act of misconduct as alleged by the Company since the time he joined his services on 19-06-1978 as a "Trainee". That according to him his termination is illegal and according to him Shri R. G. Prabhu, the Chief Manager (Utilities) is also equally responsible for the failure in the system and the Management has made discrimination against him and has victimized him by terminating his services. Further, according to him, the services of Shripad Nadkarni were terminated after his order of termination was issued and said Shripad Nadkarni and one Officer Shri G. P. Konkar who had stood as a witness in the inquiry conducted against him had deposed against him and that both these persons were forced to depose against him on false grounds and under threat of action. But the workman/Party I has not led any evidence to prove these allegations.

29. Further, according to the Party I/Workman as per the Certified Standing Orders of the Company it provides for lesser punishment such as suspension, loss of increment and demotion, but in his case the Management has taken a grave and a serious action which is grossly disproportionate to the misconduct as alleged by the Management and therefore he has prayed to set aside the order of dismissal and reduce the punishment given to him and by substituting the same with a lesser punishment as prescribed under the Certified Standing Orders. To this, I have already discussed above that a fair and proper domestic inquiry has been conducted by the Management and the negligent act of the workman happens to be serious in nature which caused a great

loss to the Company and also damaged the machinery and merely because no such incident in the past was not committed by the Workman does not necessarily mean that he is entitled for an order of setting aside his dismissal. The quantum of punishment given to the Workman is certainly proportionate to the negligent act committed by the Workman who was solely responsible to the same. The charges leveled against the Workman are all serious in nature and he alone was responsible for the said work and all the machinery was fully automatic to which no proper attention was paid by the Workman.

30. Learned Adv. Shri G. K. Sardessai has placed reliance on the authority reported in the following cases:

(1) Hombe Gowda Educational Trust and Another V/s State of Karnataka and Others, 2006 (1) SCC 430, the Apex Court has held that

"In several decisions of this Court, it has been noticed that how discipline at the workplaces/industrial undertaking received a setback. In view of the change in economic policy of the country, it may not now be proper to allow the employees to break the discipline with impunity. Our Country is governed by rule of law. All actions, therefore, must be taken in accordance with law. Law declared by this Court in terms of Article 141 of the Constitution of India, as noticed in the decisions, Supra noticed categorically demonstrates that the Tribunal would not normally interfere with the quantum of punishment imposed by the employers unless an appropriate case is made out therefore. The Tribunal being inferior to that of this Court was bound to follow the decisions of this Court which are applicable to the fact of the present case in question. The Tribunal can neither ignore the ration laid down by this Court nor refuse to follow the same".

(2) Mahindra and Mahindra Ltd. v/s N. B. Narawade, 2005 I CLR 802 SC wherein it is held that *"it is well settled that the discretion which can be exercised by the Tribunal under Section 11-A of Industrial Disputes Act in interfering with the quantum of punishment awarded by the Management, where the workman concerned is found guilty of misconduct, is available only on the existence of certain factors, like punishment being disproportionate to the gravity of misconduct so as to disturb the conscience of the Court, or the existence of any mitigating circumstances which require the reduction of sentence or the past conduct of the workman and in the absence of such factors existing, the Tribunal*

cannot by way of sympathy alone exercise the power under Section 11-A of the Act and reduce the punishment."

(3) **L&T Komatsu Ltd. v/s N. Udayakumar, 2008 I CLR 978** wherein it is held that "the jurisdiction to interfere with the punishment when it is a discharge or dismissal can be exercised by the Court only when it is satisfied that the discharge or dismissal is not justified or that it finds that the punishment imposed is shockingly disproportionate to the charges proved. Punishment of termination can be said to be disproportionate, if it would appear unconscionable and actuated by malice. The jurisdiction vested with the Court to interfere with the punishment is not to be exercised capriciously or arbitrarily. It is also well settled that when charges proved are grave vis-à-vis the establishment, interference with the punishment of dismissal is not justified. In short, the jurisdiction to interfere with the punishment should be exercised only when the punishment is shockingly disproportionate to the charges proved or that it is unconscionable and actuated by malice".

(4) **Chairman & Managing Director, United Commercial Bank and other V/s P. C. Kakkar** reported in 2003 LLR 436, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that "the court should not interfere with the administrator's decision unless it was illogical or suffers from procedural impropriety or was shocking to the conscience of the Court, in the sense that it was in defiance of logic or moral standards, only where the Court finds that a punishment is shockingly disproportionate it must record reasons for coming to such conclusion and mere expression that the punishment is shockingly disproportionate could not meet the requirement of law. Further the charges against the Respondent not being casual

in nature, but being serious, the High Court was not justified interfering with the quantum of punishment.

(5) **Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd. V/s M. Chandrashekhar Reddy and Others (2005) 2 SCC 481.**

"That apart the reasons given by the Labour Court to reduce the penalty are reasons which are not sufficient for the purpose of reducing the sentence by using its discretionary power. The fact that the misconduct now alleged is the first misconduct again is no ground to condone the misconduct. On the facts of this case as recorded by the Labour Court the loss of confidence is imminent....."

31. Hence, guided by the above authorities and in view of the above reasons, issue No. 5 is answered in the negative and it is held that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

Accordingly, I pass the following Order:

ORDER

1. The action of the Party II/M/s Zuari Industries Ltd., Jaikisan Bhavan, Zuarinagar-Goa, in terminating the services of Shri E. A. Dhumaskar, Technician, with effect from 18-07-2000, is legal and justified.
2. The Workman/Shri E. A. Dhumaskar is not entitled for any reliefs as prayed.
3. No Order as to cost.
4. Inform the Government accordingly.

Dated: 07-02-2022.

Place: Panaji, Goa.

Sd/-

(Bela N. Naik),

Presiding Officer Industrial
Tribunal and Labour Court.



Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

Court of the Principal District & Sessions Judge, North Goa

Notification

No. DSC/HOL/121/2021/05

Approved List of Holidays and Vacations for the Year 2022 for the District and Subordinate Courts in the North Goa District

Sr. No.	Holidays	Date	Days of the week
01.	New Year Day	01-01-2022	Saturday.
02.	Republic Day (*)	26-01-2022	Wednesday.
03.	Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Jayanti	19-02-2022	Saturday.
04.	Mahashivratri	01-03-2022	Tuesday.

OFFICIAL GAZETTE — GOVT. OF GOA

SERIES II No. 49

3RD MARCH, 2022

1	2	3	4
05.	Holi	18-03-2022	Friday.
06.	Gudi Padava	02-04-2022	Saturday.
07.	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Jayanti (*)/ /Maundy Thursday	14-04-2022	Thursday.
08.	Good Friday	15-04-2022	Friday.
09.	Ramzam-Id/Id-Ul-Fitr (**)	03-05-2022	Tuesday.
10.	Moharrum (**)	09-08-2022	Tuesday.
11.	Independence Day (*)	15-08-2022	Monday.
12.	Janmashtami	18-08-2022	Thursday.
13.	Hartalika	30-08-2022	Tuesday.
14.	Ganesh Chaturthi (First Day) (*)	31-08-2022	Wednesday.
15.	Ganesh Chaturthi (2nd Day)	01-09-2022	Thursday.
16.	Dussehra	05-10-2022	Wednesday.
17.	Diwali Holidays	24-10-2022 to 29-10-2022	Monday to Saturday.
18.	Feast of St. Francis Xavier	03-12-2022	Saturday.
19.	Feast of Immaculate Conception	08-12-2022	Thursday.
20.	Goa Liberation Day (*)	19-12-2022	Monday.

No Days have been proposed as Holidays on Account of:-

(1)	May Day(*)	01-05-2022	Sunday.
(2)	Id-Ul-Zuha (Bakri Id) (**)	10-07-2022	Sunday.
(3)	Mahatma Gandhi Jayanti	02-10-2022	Sunday.
(4)	Id-e-Milad (**)	09-10-2022	Sunday.
(5)	Christmas Day (*)	25-12-2022	Sunday.

Summer Vacation

From: 09-05-2022 to 05-06-2022 (Both days inclusive).

Winter Vacation

From: 24-12-2022 to 31-12-2022 (Both days inclusive).

Note:

- 1) Please note that the Hon'ble High Court has clarified that the notified holidays and vacations are likely to be modified in near future as per the recommendations of Shetty Commission and directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Writ Petition No. 1022/89 (All India Judges' Association Vs. Union of India and others).
- 2) (*) The Holidays at Sr. Nos. 2, 7, 11, 14 and 20 are paid holidays for daily rated staff if they are in service on the preceding and the succeeding working days and also at Sr. No. (1) and (5) of the list of holidays that have not been proposed on account of Sunday.
- 3) (**) The holidays at Sr. Nos. 9 and 10 will be availed on the days, the Government of Goa declares public holidays and also at Sr. Nos. (2) and (4) of the list of holidays that have not been proposed on account of Sunday.

B. P. Deshpande., Principal District Judge & Sessions Judge, North Goa.

Panaji, 30th December, 2021.

No. DSC/MAR/HOL-69/2022/1297

List of Holidays and Vacations for the Year 2022 for the District and Subordinate Courts in South Goa District

Sr. No.	Holidays	Date	Days of the week
01.	New Year Day	01-01-2022	Saturday.
02.	Republic Day	26-01-2022	Wednesday.

OFFICIAL GAZETTE — GOVT. OF GOA

SERIES II No. 49

3RD MARCH, 2022

1	2	3	4
03.	Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Jayanti	19-02-2022	Saturday.
04.	Mahashivratri	01-03-2022	Tuesday.
05.	Holi	18-03-2022	Friday.
06.	Gudi Padwa	02-04-2022	Saturday.
07.	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Jayanti/ /Maundy Thursday	14-04-2022	Thursday.
08.	Good Friday	15-04-2022	Friday.
09.	Ramzam-Id/Id-Ul-Fitr	03-05-2022	Tuesday.
10.	Moharrum	09-08-2022	Tuesday.
11.	Independence Day	15-08-2022	Monday.
12.	Janmashtami	18-08-2022	Thursday.
13.	Hartalika	30-08-2022	Tuesday.
14.	Ganesh Chaturthi (First Day)	31-08-2022	Wednesday.
15.	Ganesh Chaturthi (Second Day)	01-09-2022	Thursday.
16.	Dussehra	05-10-2022	Wednesday.
17.	Diwali Holidays	24-10-2022 to 29-10-2022	Monday to Saturday.
18.	Feast of St. Francis Xavier	03-12-2022	Saturday.
19.	Feast of Immaculate Conception	08-12-2022	Thursday.
20.	Goa Liberation Day	19-12-2022	Monday.

No Days have been proposed as Holidays on Account of:-

(1) May Day	01-05-2022	Sunday.
(2) Id-Ul-Zuha (Bakri Id)	10-07-2022	Sunday.
(3) Gandhi Jayanti	02-10-2022	Sunday.
(4) Id-e-Milad	09-10-2022	Sunday.
(5) Christmas Eve	24-12-2022	4th Saturday.
(6) Christmas Day	25-12-2022	Sunday.

Summer Vacation

From: 09-05-2022 to 05-06-2022 (Both days inclusive).

Winter Vacation

From: 24-12-2022 to 31-12-2022 (Both days inclusive).

Sd/- Irshad Agha, Principal District & Sessions Judge, South Goa.

Margao, 10th February, 2022

Notification

No. 6-28-92/LD(Misc-I)(Estt)/Misc-I/171

Read: Government Notification No. 6-28-92/
/LD(Misc-I) Part-I/1762 dated 18-12-2022.

In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (2) of Section 6 of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 (Central Act 39 of 1987) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), read with sub-rule (3) of Rule 3 of the Goa State Legal Services Authority Rules, 1996, the Government of Goa, in consultation with the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the High Court of Bombay, hereby nominates the following persons as non-official members of the State Legal Services Authority, with immediate effect.

1. Adv. Shri Sudin Usgaonkar, Senior Advocate, Panaji-Goa.
2. Adv. Shri Shailendra Bhobe, Public Prosecutor, High Court of Bombay at Goa.
3. Adv. Shri A. Clovis Da Costa, Advocate, 1st Floor, Commerce House Building, Next to Canara Bank, Margao, Goa.
4. Adv. Shri Jatin Ramaiya, 340, Gera's Imperium Star, Patto, Panaji-Goa.
5. Prof. Saba D'Silva, Principal, Kare College of Law, Margao, Goa.
6. Mr. V. B. Prabhu Verlekar, CA, Govinda Building, M.G. Road, Panaji-Goa.
7. Dr. Amita Quenim, icebreaQers, 18, First Floor, Landscape Shire, Caranzalem, Goa.

OFFICIAL GAZETTE — GOVT. OF GOA

SERIES II No. 49

3RD MARCH, 2022

8. Mr. Avelino Nicolau De Sa, La Cadita, 482
Miramar, Panaji-Goa.

The above members shall be entitled to travelling and daily allowance as prescribed under sub-rule (4) of Rule 5 of the Goa State Legal Services Authority Rules, 1996.

The other terms and conditions will be governed as per the Goa State Legal Services Authority Rules, 1996.

This issues in supersession of the earlier Government Notification No. 6-28-92/LD(Misc-I)/Part-I/1762 dated 18-12-2012.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amir Y. Parab, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 16th February, 2022.

the High Court of Judicature Appellate Side, Bombay, is hereby published for general information of the public.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amir Y. Parab, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 1st March, 2022.

Notification by the High Court of Judicature Appellate Side, Bombay

No. A-1201/G/2022/303

Read: 1. Government of Goa Notification No. 12/12/2019-LD (Estt.)/329 dated 12-02-2020.
2. Government of Goa Order No. 12/18/2020-LD(Estt.)/549 dated 05-03-2021.

The High Court has been pleased to transfer and post Ms. Durga V. Madkaikar, District Judge-3 and Additional Sessions Judge, Margao as Presiding Officer, Fast Track Special Court, Panaji, Goa for expeditious trial and disposal of rape cases and cases of offences under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012 (Central Act No. 32 of 2012), with jurisdiction over whole of State of Goa.

High Court, Bombay

Dated: 16th February, 2022.

M. W. Chandwani,

Registrar General.

Notification

No. 12/14/2014-LD(Estt)/217

On the recommendation of the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay, vide letter No. A.1218/2022/301 dated 16-02-2022, the Government of Goa is pleased to appoint Ms. Sayonara T. Laad, Member Secretary, Goa State Legal Services Authority, Penha-de-Franca, Porvorim, Goa, as the President, Children's Court, Panaji, for the State of Goa, with immediate effect.

The expenditure towards her salary and other benefits shall be debited to the Budget Head of Women & Child Development under Demand No. 58.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amir Y. Parab, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 1st March, 2022.

Notification

No. 12/18/2020-LD (Estt.)/216

The following Notification No. A-1201/G/2022/303 dated 16-02-2022 which has been issued by

Department of Personnel

Order**Order**

No. 5/4/2022-PER/433

Consequent upon the marriage of Ms. Ashwini Abhay Gauns Desai, Junior Scale Officer of Goa Civil Service with Shri Vidwal Mohan Bhagat, r/o Bhagatwada, Canacona, registered in the Office of the Civil Registrar, Canacona under Certificate of Marriage No. 298/2018, her name "Ashwini Abhay Gauns Desai" stands changed to "Ashwini Vidwal Bhagat".

And her residential address stands changed from "Bldg-F-1/3, Silvergate Estate, Nr. Forest Department, Aqueem" to "H. No. 218, Bhagatwada, Canacona, 403702".

Henceforth, her name and residential address in all official records/purpose shall be as per above changes.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vishal C. Kundaikar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 28th February, 2022.

No. 7/23/2016-PER/438

Read: 1. O.M.No. 6/8/2022-EO(MM-I) dated 11-02-2022.

The Governor of Goa is pleased to relieve Shri J. Ashok Kumar, IAS (AGMUT:2008) Secretary to Chief Minister from the State Administration with effect from 28-02-2022 (a.n.) to join his new posting as Director in the Department of Personnel & Training, Delhi, under the Central Staffing Scheme.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vishal C. Kundaikar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim, 28th February, 2022.

◆◆◆
Department of Public Health**Order**

No. 23/20/2014-I/PHD(Part) IV/294

Read: Order No. 23/20/2014-I/PHD(Part)/63 dated 08-01-2022.

The Government Order dated 08-01-2022 read in preamble stands withdrawn.

Gautami Parmekar, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 22nd February, 2022.

Order

No. 7/1/2001-I/PHD/Part-II/296

On the recommendations of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/12/54(2)/2021/505 dated 31-01-2022, the Government is pleased to declare satisfactory completion of probation period as well as Confirmation of the following Officer under the Directorate of Food & Drugs Administration, Bambolim, in the post shown against her name with effect from the date of completion of the probation period, as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Date of joining in regular service as Technical Officer	Date of completion of probation period	Confirmed in the post of
1.	Kum. Sulaksha Bhagwant Mardolkar	09-06-2016	08-06-2018	Technical Officer

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Gautami Parmekar, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 24th February, 2022.

Department of Urban Development
Directorate of Municipal Administration/ Urban Development

Notification

No. 10/671/2015-DMA/4698

The Government has constituted a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) in the name and style of Imagine Panaji Smart City Development Limited (IPSCDL) for operationalizing the Smart City Projects with Board of Directors (BoD) vide Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/658 dated 9th June, 2016, Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/2170 dated 26th October, 2017, Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/3683 dated 08th March, 2019, Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/4858 dated 14th October, 2020, Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/4830 dated 14th January, 2021, Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/5282 dated 16th February, 2021, Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/170 dated 19th April, 2021. The Government of Goa hereby re-constitutes the Board of IPSCDL with, Ex Officio members as per designation given in Column (2) in Table A below and, Non Ex Officio members as given in Table B below:

Table A

Sr. No.	Designation	Name	IPSCDL Board Designation
1	2	3	4
1.	Chief Secretary & Secretary (Finance), Shri Puneet Kumar Goel, IAS Government of Goa		Chairman.
2.	Secretary (Urban Development), Government of Goa	Dr. Tariq Thomas, IAS	Director.
3.	Collector, North Goa	Shri Ajit Roy, IAS	Director.
4.	Director/Addl. Secretary (Urban Development), Government of Goa	Shri Gurudas P. Pilarnekar	Director.
5.	Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Panaji	Shri Agnelo A. J. Fernandes	Director.
6.	Principal Chief Engineer, PWD, Government of Goa	Shri Uttam Parsekar	Director.

Table B

Sr. No	Name	IPSCDL Board Designation
1	2	3
1.	Shri Ravi Dhawan, IAS	Managing Director & CEO, IPSCDL.
2.	Shri Deepak Kochhar, US (Finance), Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs, Government of India	Director.
3.	Shri Antanasio Monserrate, MLA, Panaji Constituency	Director.
4.	Shri Rohit Joe Monserrate, Mayor, Corporation of the City of Panaji	Director.

The Department of Urban Development/Directorate of Municipal Administration will issue notifications reconstituting the board in respect of Ex Officio Members of the Board as and when there is a change of the incumbents holding the posts and for the other members as per Government order from time to time.

This is issued in supersession of all earlier Notifications issued in this regard.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Gurudas P. Pilarnekar, Director & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Municipal Administration/Urban Development).

Panaji, 24th February, 2022.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 15.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—386/150—3/2022.